

Later he was one of the 189 defenders of the Alamo, and his life was spared by Colonel William Travis' decision to send him with a request for reinforcements to Colonel James Fannin at Goliad, Texas.

He left on March 5, 1836, the day before the fall of the Alamo and the slaughter of its defenders.

He was able to rejoin the remainder of the Texas Army under General Sam Houston, and thus became the only man to fight at both the Alamo and San Jacinto.

Juan Seguin was a legendary leader in the Texas Revolution and an unsung hero of Texas. Though he is seldom given credit for his contributions, he helped establish the Texas that we are so proud of today.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this resolution.

STATEMENT AGAINST A PREVENTIVE WAR IN IRAQ

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2003

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on Monday night, literally on the eve of our swearing in as members of the 108th Congress, I spoke in Wellesley, Massachusetts at the Unitarian Universalist Society of Wellesley Hills at the invitation of that society. The topic they asked me to address was the potential war in Iraq, and I spoke to a crowd of several hundred people expressing my reasons for opposing a war in Iraq at this time. I was struck by the extremely large turnout—overflowing the hall—on a weeknight, and on a day when there had been a significant snowstorm, leaving the roads in difficult condition.

At the conclusion of the question and answer period, a representative of the society presented me with the attached statement, signed by approximately 160 people in the group. (I should note that the attendance at the meeting was much larger because not everyone who attended had been previously solicited to sign the statement.)

Mr. Speaker, given the grave nature of the question of whether or not to go to war, and the strong interest expressed by these citizens, I welcome their contribution to our debate and I ask that the Statement Against A Preventive War In Iraq presented by Members and Friends of the Unitarian Universalist Society of Wellesley Hills be printed here.

INTRODUCTION OF THE PUSH POLL DISCLOSURE ACT OF 2003

HON. THOMAS E. PETRI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2003

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing legislation to increase the disclosure requirements for telephone "push polls." As many candidates for public office have learned through personal experience, these push polls are not legitimate telephone surveys, but campaign devices designed to smear a candidate under the guise of a standard opinion poll.

Imagine a voter, who has been identified as a supporter of candidate X, being asked in a

survey if this support would continue if it was learned that candidate X was guilty of a terrible indiscretion or an outright crime. It doesn't matter whether the allegations are true because the idea that candidate X is somehow unfit for office has been planted successfully. This is a telephone push poll.

My legislation, the Push Poll Disclosure Act of 2003, requires that each participant in a poll conducted for a candidate for a Federal office seeking the opinion of more than 1,200 households be told the identity of the survey's sponsor. It also requires further disclosures when a survey's results are not to be released to the public. In this case, the cost of the poll and the sources of its funding must be reported to the Federal Election Commission, along with a count of the households contacted and a transcript of the questions asked.

The Push Poll Disclosure Act of 2003 is a simple bill. It will not hinder the traditional use of polling, nor will it burden polling firms with excessive regulations. What this bill does do, however, is regulate push polls for what they are—campaign activities, and questionable ones at that. This legislation is noncontroversial and should be bipartisan, and its passage will make campaigns for Federal office a little bit cleaner.

INTRODUCTION OF THE FED UP HIGHER EDUCATION TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2003

HON. JOHN A. BOEHNER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2003

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to join my colleague from California, the Chairman of the 21st Century Competitiveness Subcommittee, Representative HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON, in reintroducing the FED UP Higher Education Technical Amendments Act. This bipartisan bill, cosponsored by Education & the Workforce Democrat committee members CAROLYN MCCARTHY (D-NY) and DAVID WU (D-OR), provides for technical amendments to the Higher Education Act, which will be up for reauthorization later this year.

Representative MCKEON, a leader in the House on higher education issues, along with the late Representative Patsy Mink (D-HI), initiated the FED UP process to make it easier for Hispanic-Serving Institutions to receive Federal aid, help college students avoid defaulting on their student loans, clarify that Federal scholarship aid can go to low-income and minority students for law school, and improve higher education access in other ways recommended by the higher education community.

The FED UP project is a unique effort, utilizing the Internet to get input directly from those most affected by current Federal higher education regulations—students and school officials themselves. The project solicited comments from student aid professionals from across the country in an effort to pinpoint unnecessary Federal rules and red tape that could be streamlined without jeopardizing the integrity of America's student financial assistance programs.

The response was phenomenal, both in terms of the number of comments received and in the reaction from the higher education

community. Many of those responding commented that this is the first time Congress has put forward an effort to hear directly from those on the front lines of assisting students. Another said this is the way government should work, Congress listening to the experts and getting input, rather than just dictating a course of action. This bill is intended to address noncontroversial, budget neutral changes to the Higher Education Act that will assist in reducing red tape. It also clears the decks of clerical and technical problems within the act to set the stage for the Committee to begin the reauthorization process later this year.

This year I hope we can move this legislation through the floor in a swift manner. As part of an ongoing election-year effort to disrupt proceedings in the House, Democrat leaders in July 2002 blocked floor passage of the noncontroversial, bipartisan FED UP initiative. Twenty-seven House Democrats, including the late Representative Patsy Mink, broke with the Democratic leadership and joined Republicans in voting "yes" on the measure, which is also strongly backed by the higher education community.

This legislation was created in an effort to do what is right for students, institutions and others involved in providing higher education. The FED UP measure will help to untie the hands of students and institutions through a series of common-sense steps that will make a difference while paving the way for the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act in the 108th Congress.

INTRODUCTION OF THE FED UP HIGHER EDUCATION TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2003

HON. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2003

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, today, I am proud to join my colleague, the Chairman of the House Education and the Workforce Committee, John Boehner, in introducing the FED UP Higher Education Technical Amendments Act of 2003. This legislation is the result of a great deal of effort to improve the efficiencies and effectiveness of the Title IV student aid programs through the review of overly burdensome and outdated regulations.

During the 107th Congress, the House Education and the Workforce Committee launched the FED UP project (short for "Upping the Effectiveness of our Federal Student Aid Programs") to identify and simplify burdensome regulations in the Higher Education Act of 1965 (HEA) that work against college students and personnel. The initiative, which was started to bring some sense to the regulations that students and the higher education community must deal with on a daily basis, received over 3,000 responses from college officials, administrators and other personnel who operate America's institutions of higher learning. After all of the responses were catalogued, the Department of Education initiated a negotiated rulemaking process to consider the regulatory changes included in the project, and have since published final regulations implementing many of the FED UP proposals.

These proposed amendments to the Higher Education Act of 1965 continue this effort to

identify and simplify burdensome regulations that work against college students and personnel, and are non-controversial and technical in nature. They provide for improvements that will reduce red tape for colleges and universities and will improve the financial aid process for students. Enacting these changes now will allow the House Education and Workforce Committee to address larger, more intricate proposals during the reauthorization of the HEA without being bogged down with technical and clerical issues.

This legislation provides for the streamlining and increased effectiveness of many provisions within the HEA. It reinstates two provisions beneficial to both students and institutions that expired on September 30, 2002. Specifically, schools with default rates under 10 percent for three consecutive fiscal years will be permitted to waive a 30-day delay requirement for first-year, first-time borrowers. Schools meeting the same low default rate standard would also be permitted to request one term loans in a single disbursement, rather than the required multiple disbursements. These provisions act as an incentive to schools to keep their default rates low and assist students in getting access to their loan funds on a timelier basis.

The FED UP Higher Education Technical Amendments Act of 2003 also corrects an error in an overly broad implementation of a provision affecting a student's eligibility for Title IV financial aid once convicted of a federal drug offense. Only those students enrolled and receiving Title IV aid when convicted will be affected once this correction is implemented.

A drafting error during the 1998 reauthorization of the HEA inadvertently removed the eligibility of not-for-profit foreign veterinary schools from participation in the Federal Family Education Loan (FFEL) Program. This legislation will correct that error and keep hundreds of students from losing their loan eligibility.

This legislation also provides clarification for financial aid officers in the return of Title IV funds. It clarifies how the return of Title IV funds should be implemented for schools utilizing clock hours, and what percentage of funds need to be included in any return. The language also makes clear that Leveraging Educational Assistance Partnership (LEAP) funds may be removed from the return of Title IV funds formula due to the mix of State and Federal funds at the school level. It clarifies that students who have been home schooled, and are treated as such under State law, are eligible for admittance into an institution of higher education as defined in the HEA and are eligible to receive financial aid. It also allows aid professionals to use professional judgment in determining financial need for a student who is declared a ward of the court.

This bill allows for the use of technology wherever possible to enhance and improve communication and the transfer of information. This includes reporting by States in providing information on teacher quality and providing students with voter registration materials.

This legislation allows student loan borrowers to receive more timely assistance from their lenders when they are seeking forbearance of loan payments. It allows a lender to accept a request for assistance over the telephone as long as a confirmation notice of the agreement reached is provided to the bor-

rower and the borrower's file is updated. This eliminates the need for borrowers to sign paper documents requesting help and agreeing in writing to what they already have agreed to verbally.

The FED UP Higher Education Technical Amendments Act of 2003 corrects an administrative issue in the payment of insurance to lenders and reinsurance to guaranty agencies on borrower default claims when the borrower failed to establish eligibility for that loan. This change reinstates long-standing policy of the Department of Education in the payment of these specific claims, which was altered by a new reporting process put in place via a forms change.

This legislation allows Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSIs) to apply for HSI grants without having to wait two years in between applications. It also clarifies allowable uses of grant funds within the Thurgood Marshall Legal Educational Opportunity Program. It also provides clarification within the Federal TRIO programs that institutions with more than one campus may apply for separate grants to serve different populations at different campuses.

This legislation also provides clarification as to what items must be included within the annual report of the Department of Education's Performance Based Organization (PBO). Finally, the bill corrects the names of the authorizing committees throughout the HEA.

The FED UP Higher Education Technical Amendments Act of 2003 will take us one step closer to reducing burdensome rules and allow financial aid administrators and others in the higher education community to do their jobs more efficiently and effectively. Program integrity and service to students remain the priority and this legislation accomplishes both.

This legislation also brings forward, as an addition to FED UP, the provisions passed by the House of Representatives in the previous Congress that deal with the forgiveness of student loans for spouses of victims of the tragedy of September 11th and provides for the additional innovation of the delivery of post-secondary education by eliminating the rule prohibiting institutions of higher education from offering more than 50 percent of their coursework through distance education. This provision provides for a controlled look at increasing the availability of distance education, while protecting the integrity of the student aid programs.

We will be beginning the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act with this Congress and this is a very positive, productive and efficient first step. FED UP has accomplished its goal of streamlining the current regulatory system to the extent possible, while maintaining or improving program integrity, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

INTRODUCTION OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY GUARANTEE PLUS ACT OF 2003

HON. E. CLAY SHAW, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 2003

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, whether we live in prosperous or uncertain times, American families need economic security—the kind of economic security that Social Security provides.

For 68 years, Social Security has protected workers and their families from falling into poverty if a breadwinner retires, suffers disability, or dies. Social Security has endured, unlike many other government programs, because its architects designed it to be owned by workers and to treat all workers fairly.

Social Security has evolved over the decades, strengthening its protections and finances along the way. However, our nation's demographics and economics are fundamentally changing, and Social Security's ability to continue meeting its promises is threatened. The Social Security Guarantee Plus Plan I am introducing today will enable Social Security to continue fulfilling its vital role in the lives of all Americans.

First, the Guarantee Plus Plan keeps intact the Social Security safety net. Promised benefits, including cost of living increases, are guaranteed for people receiving benefits today, tomorrow and for all future generations.

Second, the plan treats all workers fairly. Workers have paid into the system, it's their money, and we must protect and enhance their investment. It's not fair to workers to raise their payroll taxes or lower their benefits. Nor is it fair for the government to tell workers to work longer. That's why my plan does not raise taxes, does not lower benefits, and does not change the retirement age.

Third, Social Security payroll taxes belong to the workers who paid them. My plan gives workers a real ownership stake in Social Security by allowing them to choose to receive a tax cut to invest directly in prudent, individually-selected, market investments. For the first time, a nation of savers, not the government, will own and control the assets backing Social Security. Should an individual die before becoming eligible, the balance of their money will be passed along to their heirs.

Fourth, under my plan, Social Security can be counted on for the next 75 years, and beyond. Real assets guarantee current and future benefits, establishing a sound and sustainable financial footing. No longer will there be a need to periodically increase taxes or lower benefits to keep the program working.

Beyond keeping these promises to all Americans, we must also do more to improve Social Security for the women of our nation. Because of their longer life expectancies and lower earnings, women are more likely to suffer poverty in old age. Social Security is a vital safety net for these women. In addition, because benefits are based on earnings, women are disadvantaged when they choose to stay home to raise their children. The Guarantee Plus Plan protects our daughters, our mothers, our aunts and our grandmothers, not only by securing the future of Social Security and guaranteeing full benefits, but also by enhancing benefits for widows, divorced spouses, and working mothers. These benefits become available immediately in my bill.

Here's how the Social Security Guarantee Plus Plan works. The plan guarantees full, promised, current law benefits for all workers, whether you are 6 or 65. Just as companies must back your pension plan with real assets, the Guarantee Plus Plan saves Social Security by setting aside real assets, not IOUs, to pre-fund benefits. These assets are saved in each worker's own account, thereby providing workers the opportunity to create real wealth for themselves and their families.

Workers who choose to participate will receive a refundable credit of up to 4 percent of